

**DNA No. 1 to EA OR128-02-15: Log Yarding and Skidding**

**Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management, Coos Bay District, Oregon

---

**A. Describe the Proposed Action:**

Approximately 147 conifer trees from within an estimated 4-acre electric powerline right-of-way were felled by the Coos-Curry Electric Co-op and left on site. The right-of-way is located parallel to the McKinley County Road in Section 5 of T28S R11W. This action proposes to remove the logs for sale and for future use in fisheries habitat restoration projects. The area adjacent to the right-of-way is 40-60 year old timber in the General Forest Management Area (i.e., Matrix). To fulfill down wood requirements in Matrix lands as described in the *Standards and Guidelines of the FSEIS Management of Habitat for Late-successional and Old Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl* (Interagency 1994), four down trees will be left on site to meet the minimum requirement of 120 linear feet of logs per acre. The remaining trees will be removed to a designated landing adjacent to the McKinley County Road using a yarding machine, tracked vehicle, lowboy or self-loading log truck. At the landing, trees will be bucked and sorted as directed by an authorized officer. Approximately 202 logs ranging in length from 32-40 feet or 54% of the volume (26 MBF) will be hauled to BLM's Middle Creek shop area where they will be stockpiled for future in-stream enhancement projects. The remaining log volume will be sold. All operations will be conducted during dry weather conditions, and in compliance with USFWS Biological Opinion #1-7-98-F-079, daily timing restrictions will apply to avoid potential disturbance to marbled murrelets in nearby unsurveyed suitable habitat. Care will be taken to avoid contact with the lines and the utility company will be notified prior to project initiation.

**B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance:**

Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on the Management of Habitat for Late Successional and Old Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl, Standards and Guidelines, and Record of Decision (1994).

Coos Bay District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement, September 1994.

Coos Bay District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan, May 1995.

North Fork Coquille Watershed Analysis, 2001.

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on Management of Habitat for Late Successional and Old Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl and its Record of Decision acknowledge the importance of down logs to wildlife and recommend mitigation and restoration projects to ensure their persistence. As described above, requirements related to the level of down wood in the Matrix would be met by leaving four trees. Approximately half of the remaining logs would be used to enhance fisheries habitat elsewhere on the District and the remainder would be sold to the highest bidder. Use of the down logs to augment fisheries habitat adheres to the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives for the maintenance and restoration of riparian reserves.

The Coos Bay District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision states that within the Matrix down logs will be retained at levels sufficient to support wildlife species associated with down wood. Required levels are consistent with those set forth in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on Managing of Habitat for Late Successional and Old Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl and its Record of Decision.

The North Fork Coquille Watershed Analysis details the importance of coarse woody debris, identifies current deficiencies of down logs as being of concern for fisheries and aquatic habitats, and recommends the restoration of these important habitat elements to the landscape.

**C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.**

EA OR128-02-15, Log Yarding and Skidding prepared June, 2002. Analyzes the effects of down log skidding, yarding, and hauling from utility corridors and blow down sites.

Biological Assessment for FY01-02 Timber Sales, Other Forest Removal Projects, Individual Tree Projects and Tree Climbing, July 2000, and the subsequent Biological Opinion rendered by the US Fish and Wildlife Service in September 2000 (USFWS 1998; #1-7-98-F-079).

Biological Assessment and Biological Opinion for Programmatic USDA Forest Service and USDI Bureau of Land Management Activities Affecting Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast Chinook Salmon, Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast Coho, Oregon Coast Chinook, and Oregon Coast Coho within the Southwestern Oregon Province, Oregon.

**D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria:**

**1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is it a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?**

Yes, the proposal to remove down logs from a utility corridor is the same action previously analyzed in EA OR128-02-15: Log Yarding and Skidding, with the addition of a site in the North Fork Coquille Watershed. The additional proposed area does not significantly differ in site characteristics from the analyzed sites, thus effects are not expected to differ.

**2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Yes. The two alternatives analyzed in the EA were appropriate with respect to the current proposal. The current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values do not differ.

**3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?**

Yes, the existing analysis is valid and current (2002). No new information or circumstances exist.

**4. Does the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?**

Yes, the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing documents continues to be appropriate for the proposal to remove down logs, and no valid new technologies or methodologies exist or are proposed. Removal of the logs with a skidder will be easily accomplished as the right-of-way is within close proximity of McKinley County Road.

**5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?**

The potential direct and indirect impacts of the proposed removal of down logs are unchanged from those identified in the existing EA. In addition, the FY 96-2002 Programmatic Projects, Coos Bay Biological Assessment (C96-01b) describes impacts associated with the proposed project and associated Project Design Criteria from the 1998 Coos Bay District Biological Opinion (USFWS 1998; #1-7-98-F-079) will be implemented to minimize disturbance effects on the northern spotted owl and marbled murrelet. Therefore, although the site of the proposed project was not specifically analyzed, effects and site characteristics are essentially identical to some of the previously analyzed sites.

**6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?**

Yes, the cumulative impacts of the proposed action are essentially unchanged.

**7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?**

Yes, the level of analysis and public involvement was adequate regarding the proposal action. During the 30 day comment period, only two comments were received, neither of which are relevant to the proposed action.

**E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this worksheet (see attached sheet).**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Madeleine Vander Heyden	Wildlife
Craig Carlson	Forestry
Dan VanSlyke	Fisheries
Tim Votaw	Hazardous Materials
Stephan Samuels	Cultural Resources
Bill Elam	Fuels
Timothy Barnes	Soils, Geology, Hydrology
Jennifer Sperling	Botany
Scott Knowles	S&M Mollusks, Port Orford cedar, Environmental Justice, Noxious Weeds

**Conclusion**

☐ Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.

Decision recommended by: /s/ Kathy Wall Date: 9/10/2002  
Kathy Wall, NRSA

/s/ Ralph Thomas Date: 9/13/2002  
Ralph Thomas, NRSA

/s/ Steve Fowler Date: 9/12/2002  
Steve Fowler, NRSA

Decision Approved by: /s/ M. Elaine Raper Date: 9/13/2002  
Elaine Raper, Umpqua Field Manager

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision.